

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (LODGING) NO.1411 OF 2005

Usha widow of Saurabh Tanna

....Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer, Building Proposal & Anr.

....Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION (LODGING) NO.1412 OF 2005

Jameel Ahmed Hussain Quereshi

....Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer, Building Proposal & Anr.

....Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION (LODGING) NO.1413 OF 2005

Virendra Tiwari

....Petitioner

Versus

Executive Engineer, Building Proposal & Anr.

....Respondents

Mr.P. G. Lad for the Petitioners.
Ms.Aruna Savla for the Respondents.

CORAM : DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J. &
S.J. VAZIFDAR, J.
DATE : 30TH JUNE, 2005.

P.C. :

It is stated by the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner that the facts are identical in all these Writ Petitions, therefore we propose to dispose of the aforementioned Writ Petitions.

2. The Petitioners in these Petitions are aggrieved by the notices issued by the Respondents under Section 53(1) of the Maharashtra Regional Town Planning Act, 1966 all dated 16.4.2005, by which the Petitioners have been asked to demolish the unauthorized work at Flat Nos.101, 102, and 103, 1st floor, Emerald Apartment, Vakola, Santacruz (East) within one month. The Petitioners have sent a lawyer's notices in reply to notices dated 16.4.2005. The grievance of the Petitioners is that the replies

submitted by them have not been considered by the Respondents.

3. To cut short the controversy, the learned counsel appearing for the Respondents submits that they would treat these Petitions as comprehensive representations of the Petitioners and decide the same by a reasoned order after affording hearing to the Petitioners as expeditiously as possible and in any event within six weeks from today.

4. To avoid any further delay, we direct the Petitioners to appear before the Executive Engineer, Building Proposals, (Western Suburbs) H & K Ward – Respondent No.1 on 7th July, 2005 at 11.00 a.m. and on any other dates fixed by Respondent No.1 in his office.

5. The parties are directed to maintain status-quo as of today and this order of status-quo shall continue for another two weeks from the date of service of the orders on the Petitioners.

6. No further directions are necessary in these Writ Petitions. These Writ Petitions are accordingly disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

S.J. VAZIFDAR, J.